arXiv:1703.02832v1 [math.AP] 8 Mar 2017

MULTIPLE NORMALIZED SOLUTIONS FOR A COMPETING SYSTEM OF SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS

THOMAS BARTSCH AND NICOLA SOAVE

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of infinitely many solutions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, for the nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda_1 u = \mu u^3 + \beta u v^2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ -\Delta v - \lambda_2 v = \mu v^3 + \beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ u, v > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 = a^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v^2 = a^2, \end{cases}$$

where $a, \mu > 0$ and $\beta \le -\mu$ are prescribed. Our solutions satisfy $u \neq v$ so they do not come from a scalar equation.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the stationary nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda_1 u = \mu u^3 + \beta u v^2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ -\Delta v - \lambda_2 v = \mu v^3 + \beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ u, v > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 = a^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v^2 = a^2, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $a, \mu > 0$ and $\beta < 0$ are prescribed and $u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ have to be determined.

This problem possesses many physical motivations, e.g. it appear in models for nonlinear optics and Bose-Einstein condensation (we refer to [6] and the references therein for a more exhaustive discussion). Due to the physical background, it seems natural to search for normalized solutions (i.e. solutions with prescribed L^2-norm), but despite this fact most of the papers regarding (1.1) deal with the system with fixed frequencies (i.e. $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$ are prescribed, and the L^2-constraints are neglected), and not much is known about the full problem (1.1). The only results available in the setting considered here are presented in [5, 6], where for possibly non-symmetric systems we proved existence of one positive radial normalized solution, both for suitable choices of $\beta > 0$ [5], and for all $\beta < 0$ [6]. In this paper we consider the symmetric problem (1.1) and, exploiting the symmetry, we prove the existence of infinitely many solutions, which will be found as critical points of the *energy* functional $J_\beta : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$J_\beta(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mu u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + \mu v^4, \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J50, 35J15, 35J60.

Key words and phrases. Elliptic systems, Schrödinger systems, Natural constraint, min-max methods.

Acknowledgements: Nicola Soave is partially supported by the project ERC Advanced Grant 2013 n. 339958 "Complex Patterns for Strongly Interacting Dynamical Systems - COMPAT", by the PRIN-2015KB9WPT_010 Grant: "Variational methods, with applications to problems in mathematical physics and geometry", and by the GNAMPA group.

with

$$\mathcal{S} := S_a \times S_a, \quad \text{and} \quad S_a := \left\{ w \in H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^2 = a^2 \right\}.$$

Here $H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ denotes the space of radially symmetric functions in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In this perspective, λ_1 and λ_2 arise as Lagrange multipliers with respect to the mass constraint. Clearly, if $(u, v, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ solves (1.1) then so does $(v, u, \lambda_2, \lambda_1)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $a, \mu > 0$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\beta_k > -\mu$ such that for $\beta < \beta_k$ the problem (1.1) has at least k different pairs $(u_{j,\beta}, v_{j,\beta}, \lambda^j_{1,\beta}, \lambda^j_{2,\beta})$, $(v_{j,\beta}, u_{j,\beta}, \lambda^j_{2,\beta}, \lambda^j_{1,\beta})$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, of radial solutions with increasing energy. The solutions satisfy $u_{j,\beta} \neq v_{j,\beta}$, and $J(u_{j,\beta}, v_{j,\beta}) \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$, provided $\beta \leq -\mu$.*

We can also show that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, the family $\{(u_{k,\beta}, v_{k,\beta}) : \beta \leq -\mu\}$ segregates in the limit of strong competition:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\beta \to -\infty$, up to a subsequence we have:*

- *(i)* $(\lambda^k_{1,\beta}, \lambda^k_{2,\beta}) \to (\lambda^k_1, \lambda^k_2)$, *with* $\lambda^k_1, \lambda^k_2 \leq 0$;
- *(ii)* $(u_{k,\beta}, v_{k,\beta}) \to (u_k, v_k)$ *in* $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *and in* $H^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, *for any* $\alpha \in (0,1)$;
- *(iii)* u_k *and* v_k *are nonnegative Lipschitz continuous functions having disjoint positivity sets, in the sense that* $u_k v_k \equiv 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^N$;
- *(iv) the difference* $u_k - v_k$ *is a sign-changing radial solution of*

$$-\Delta w - \lambda^k_1 w^+ + \lambda^k_2 w^- = \mu w^3 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Remark 1.3. The scalar problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w - \lambda w = \mu w^3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \\ w \in S_a \end{cases} \qquad \text{for some } \lambda < 0; \tag{1.3}$$

has a unique positive radial solution $w_0 \in H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Setting

$$w_\beta(x) := \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\beta}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} w_0\left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\beta}x\right), \quad \lambda_\beta := \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\beta}\right)^2,$$

for $\beta > -\mu$ we obtain a smooth curve

$$\mathcal{T} := \{(w_\beta, w_\beta, \lambda_\beta, \lambda_\beta) : \beta > -\mu\}$$

of symmetric solutions of (1.1). This suggests that the solutions in Theorem 1.1 bifurcate from $\mathcal{T}$ as in [2]. We do not pursue this approach here.

In what follows we recall basic facts concerning the existence of normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and describe the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.1, emphasizing the main differences with respect to the results already present in the literature. This serves also as motivation to our study.

The homogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with normalization constraint is

$$-\Delta w - \lambda w = |w|^{p-2} w \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w^2 = a^2. \tag{1.4}$$

It is well known that two exponents play a special role for existence and properties of the solutions: in addition to the *Sobolev critical* exponent $p = 2N/(N-2)$, we have the L^2*-critical* one $p = 2+4/N$. If $2 < p < 2+4/N$ (L^2-subcritical regime), then the energy functional associated to (1.4) is bounded from below on the L^2-sphere S_a, while if $p \geq 2 + 4/N$ (L^2-critical or supercritical regime) this is not true and one is forced to search for critical points that are not global minima. The critical

Sobolev exponent defines the threshold for the existence of a H^1-solution. The very same discussion applies to systems of type (1.1), and this is why our results concern the space dimension $N = 3$: since we are considering cubic nonlinearities, in dimension $N = 1, 2, 3$ or 4 we have respectively a L^2-subcritical, L^2-critical, L^2-supercritical and Sobolev-subcritical, or Sobolev-critical setting, and each framework requires its own techniques. With regard to this, we mention that while for L^2-subcritical problems many results are available (see e.g. [13, 14, 21, 22] for equations and [7, 11, 15] for systems), the L^2-critical or supercritical ones are much less understood, and we refer to [3, 12] for equations and to [4, 5, 6] for systems.

Let us focus now on system (1.1). Since the problem is invariant both under rotation, and with respect to the involution $(u, v) \mapsto (v, u)$, it is natural to adapt the Krasnoselskii genus approach to the constrained functional $J|_{\mathcal{S}}$. This is the strategy used in [16], where the authors considered normalized solution to (1.1) in the case when $\mu < 0$ and $\mathbb{R}^3$ is replaced by a bounded domain Ω (with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions). In such a situation the functional is bounded from below, coercive, and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on the product of the L^2-spheres[1]. All these properties, which are essential to use the Krasnoselskii genus, fail when considering (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mu > 0$: the functional J is indeed unbounded both from above and from below on $\mathcal{S}$, and the Palais-Smale condition is not satisfied. In [8], where system (1.1) is studied in the case of fixed frequencies $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$, the same complications are overcome with the introduction of a Nehari-type manifold $\mathcal{N}$ associated to the problem. The authors proved that the constrained functional $J|_{\mathcal{N}}$ is bounded from below, coercive, and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.

Searching for normalized solutions the Nehari manifold is not available, but in [6] we introduced a different additional constraint, suited to treat problems with normalization conditions:

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta := \left\{ (u, v) \in \mathcal{S} : \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 = \frac{3}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mu u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + \mu v^4 \right\}.$$

This is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ submanifold of $\mathcal{S}$, see [6, Lemma 2.2][2], and using the Pohozaev identity it is easy to check that any weak solution to (1.1) stays in $\mathcal{P}_\beta$. In [6, Theorem 2.1], we showed that $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ is a *natural constraint*; see Theorem 2.2 below.

We aim at adapting the Krasnoselskii genus approach to the constrained functional $J|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$. It is not difficult to check that the functional $J|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ is bounded from below and coercive, but, differently to [8], the Palais-Smale condition is not satisfied on $\mathcal{P}_\beta$. This is a phenomenon purely related to the normalization conditions, and is motivated by the lack of compactness of the embedding $H^1_{\mathrm{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In particular, there exist Palais-Smale sequences for $J|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ converging weakly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (actually strongly in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$) to *semi-trivial* bound states $(w, 0)$ and $(0, w)$, where w is a radial solution to (1.3); we stress that $(w, 0)$ and $(0, w)$ do not stay on $\mathcal{S}$, hence not on $\mathcal{P}_\beta$.

As further complication, we observe that since λ_1, λ_2 are not prescribed and could be non-negative, the operators $-\Delta - \lambda_i$ could be both non-positive and non-invertible. This is particularly relevant here since we are interested in positive solutions, and not knowing the sign of λ_i we cannot argue as in [8], where the authors simply replaced the nonlinearity μu^3 with $\mu(u^+)^3$ in (1.1), found non-trivial solutions of the new problem, and applied the maximum principle to obtain positive solutions of the original system.

In light of the previous discussion, the Krasnoselskii genus approach has to be considerably refined, and in particular a careful analysis of the behavior of Palais-Smale sequences is needed. We shall first show in Section 3 that specially constructed Palais-Smale sequences do converge.

[1] Indeed, in [16] the authors exploit a uniform-in-β Palais-Smale condition to derive the convergence of the whole minimax structure to a limit problem.

[2] In [6] we showed that $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ manifold since this was enough for our purpose, the extra regularity is straightforward.

Afterwards, in Section 5 we set up a minimax scheme producing infinitely many such sequences. Sections 2 and 4 are devoted to the proofs of auxiliary results, and in Section 6 we complete the proofs of our main results.

To conclude the introduction, we mention that both (1.4) and system (1.1) are studied also in bounded domains. When dealing with fixed frequencies, the search for radial solutions in $\mathbb{R}^N$, or for solutions satisfying homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions in Ω bounded, can be treated essentially in the same way. It is remarkable that, on the contrary, searching for normalized solutions the two problems "$\mathbb{R}^N$" vs. "bounded domains" presents substantial differences. In order to better understand this aspect, we invite the reader to compare the results and the techniques used here and in [3,5,6,12] in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and those in [9,17,18,19] in bounded domains.

2. Notation and preliminaries

Without loss of generality, from now on we assume $\mu = 1$. As already announced, we aim at applying critical point theory to the functional J on $\mathcal{P}_\beta$. We always work in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, and hence we often write H^1 instead of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^2)$, to keep the notation as compact as possible. The same discussion applies to all the functional spaces we shall use. Regarding this, we recall that $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ denotes the closure of $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to norm $\|w\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} := \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}$.

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we define the function

$$(s \star w)(x) := e^{3s/2} w(e^s x). \tag{2.1}$$

One can easily check that $\|s \star w\|_{L^2} = \|w\|_{L^2}$ for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. As a consequence, given $(u, v) \in S_a \times S_a$, it results that $s \star (u, v) := (s \star u, s \star v) \in S_a \times S_a$ as well, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

We consider the real valued function $\Psi^\beta_{(u,v)}(s) := J_\beta(s \star (u, v))$. By changing variables in the integrals, we obtain

$$\Psi^\beta_{(u,v)}(s) = \frac{e^{2s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{e^{3s}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4. \tag{2.2}$$

Let us introduce

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta := \left\{ (u, v) \in S_a \times S_a : \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4 > 0 \right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Clearly $\mathcal{E}_\beta = S_a \times S_a$ in case $-1 < \beta < +\infty$, while for $\beta \le -1$ it results that $\mathcal{E}_\beta \subset S_a \times S_a$ is an open subset with strict inclusion. By definition and using (2.2), it is not difficult to check that:

Lemma 2.1. *For any $(u, v) \in S_a \times S_a$, a value $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is a critical point of $\Psi^\beta_{(u,v)}$ if and only if $s \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$. It results that:*

(i) If $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}_\beta$, then there exists a unique critical point $s^\beta_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$ for $\Psi^\beta_{(u,v)}$, which is a strict maximum point, and is defined by

$$\exp(s^\beta_{(u,v)}) = \frac{4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2}{3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4}. \tag{2.4}$$

In particular, if $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$, then $s^\beta_{(u,v)} = 0$.

(ii) If $(u, v) \notin \mathcal{E}_\beta$, then $\Psi^\beta_{(u,v)}$ has no critical point in $\mathbb{R}$.

For the convenience of the reader we state Theorem 2.1 from [6].

Theorem 2.2. *If $\{(\bar u_n, \bar v_n)\}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for the restriction $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$, then there exists a possibly different sequence $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \mathcal{P}_\beta$ such that*

(*i*) $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ *is a Palais-Smale sequence for* J_β *on* $\mathcal{S}$*;*
(*ii*) $\|u_n - \bar{u}_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|v_n - \bar{v}_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Moreover, if (u, v) *is a critical point for* $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$*, then* (u, v) *is a critical point for* J_β *on* $\mathcal{S}$.

3. A partial Palais-Smale condition

We recall that problem (1.3) has a unique positive radial solution w_0 (for a suitable $\lambda < 0$). We denote by ℓ the energy level associated to w_0, that is

$$\ell := I(w_0), \quad I(w) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla w|^2 - \frac{1}{4}w^4. \tag{3.1}$$

It is well known that $\ell > 0$ is the ground state energy level of (1.3) (see Section 2 in [5] for a complete discussion).

We wish to investigate the behavior of any Palais-Smale sequence for the constrained functional $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$. We start with a preliminary remark.

Lemma 3.1. *The constrained functional* $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ *is bounded from below and coercive.*

Proof. The statement follows straightforwardly from the fact that

$$J_\beta(u, v) = \frac{1}{6}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 = \frac{1}{8}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4 \tag{3.2}$$

for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$. □

Notice that, as a consequence of this and of Theorem 2.2, any Palais-Smale sequence for $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ gives a *bounded* Palais-Smale sequence for $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{S}}$ at a finite level. The existence of bounded Palais-Smale sequences for problems with L^2-constraints is a highly non-trivial fact, and is the initial step in the proof of the following statement.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\beta \le 0$ *be fixed. Let* $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ *be a Palais-Smale sequence for* $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$*, with*

$$u_n^-, v_n^- \to 0 \quad a.e.\ in\ \mathbb{R}^3, \quad and \quad \lim_n J_\beta(u_n, v_n) =: c \in (0, +\infty).$$

a) If $c \neq \ell$*, then up to a subsequence* $(u_n, v_n) \to (u, v)$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^2)$*, and* (u, v) *is a solution to* (1.1) *for some* $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$.

b) If $c = \ell$*, then one of the following alternatives occurs:*

(*i*) $(u_n, v_n) \to (u, v)$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^2)$ *up to a subsequence, where* (u, v) *is a solution to* (1.1) *for some* $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$ *with* $J_\beta(u, v) = \ell$.
(*ii*) *either* $u_n \to w_0$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $v_n \to 0$ *strongly in* $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$*, or* $v_n \to w_0$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $u_n \to 0$ *strongly in* $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$*, up to a subsequence.*

Proof. We refine the analysis from [5, 6] to prove the convergence of the Palais-Smale sequences. The phrase "up to a subsequence" will be implicitly understood in this proof. We slightly change the notation with respect to the statement. Let $\{(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n)\}$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$, and let $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ be the associated Palais-Smale sequence for J_β on $\mathcal{S}$, given by Theorem 2.2. In what follows we investigate the convergence of $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$; by point (*ii*) in Theorem 2.2, Proposition 3.2 will follow.

The weak convergence of (u_n, v_n) to a limit $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^2)$ follows directly by Lemma 3.1. By compactness of the embedding $H^1_{\mathrm{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $(u_n, v_n) \to (\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ strongly in L^4 and a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Notice also that by (3.2)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 \ge 5c > 0 \tag{3.3}$$

for every n sufficiently large. Now, since $dJ_\beta|_{S_a\times S_a}(u_n,v_n)\to 0$ (and using the fact that the problem is invariant under rotation), by the Lagrange multipliers rule there exist two sequences of real numbers $(\lambda_{1,n})$ and $(\lambda_{2,n})$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla\varphi+\nabla v_n\cdot\nabla\psi-u_n^3\varphi-v_n^3\psi-\beta u_nv_n(u_n\psi+v_n\varphi)\big) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\lambda_{1,n}u_n\varphi+\lambda_{2,n}v_n\psi)=o(1)\|(\varphi,\psi)\|_{H^1} \tag{3.4}$$

for every $(\varphi,\psi)\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)$, with $o(1)\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Using the boundedness of $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ and equation (3.3), one can prove as in [5, Lemma 3.8] that $\lambda_{1,n}\to\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_{2,n}\to\lambda_2$, and $\lambda_1+\lambda_2<0$, hence at least one of λ_1 and λ_2 is a strictly negative value. If $\lambda_1<0$ (resp. $\lambda_2<0$), then $u_n\to\bar u$ (resp. $v_n\to\bar v$) strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ by [5, Lemma 3.9]. Notice also that, by weak and a.e. convergence and by (3.4), the limit $(\bar u,\bar v)\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)$ solves

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta\bar u-\lambda_1\bar u=\bar u^3+\beta\bar u\bar v^2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3\\ -\Delta\bar v-\lambda_2\bar v=\bar v^3+\beta\bar u^2\bar v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3\\ \bar u\geq 0,\ \bar v\geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,\end{cases}\qquad \text{for some } \lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.5}$$

So far we showed that, independently of the level c, the Palais-Smale sequence $\{(\bar u_n,\bar v_n)\}$ tends weakly to a solution of (3.5) (notice that the mass constraint is not present), one of the Lagrange multiplier λ_i is negative, and the corresponding component is strongly convergent. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\lambda_1<0$, so that $u_n\to\bar u$ strongly. If $\lambda_2<0$, then also $v_n\to\bar v$ strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (see [5, Lemma 3.9] again), and we are done. In what follows we prove that if $c\neq\ell$, then it is necessary that $\lambda_2<0$; while if $c=\ell$, then it is possible that $\lambda_2\geq 0$, but in such a situation $v_n\to 0$ strongly in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and $u_n\to w_0$ strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Suppose then that $\lambda_2\geq 0$. Since $\lambda_1<0$, the function $\bar u$ decays exponentially at infinity, see [6, Lemma 3.11]. As a consequence, if $\lambda_2\geq 0$, then

$$-\Delta\bar v+c(x)\bar v\geq 0\quad\text{in }\mathbb{R}^3,\quad\text{with}\quad 0\leq c(x):=-\beta\bar u^2(x)\leq Ce^{-C|x|}.$$

Since moreover $\bar v\geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\bar v\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, by the Liouville-type Lemma 3.12 in [6] we infer that $\bar v\equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. But then $\bar u$ is positive and solves (1.3), and by uniqueness $\bar u=w_0$. It is well known that any radial solution to (1.3) stays in

$$\mathcal{M}:=\left\{u\in S_a^r:\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u|^2=\frac34\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u^4\right\},$$

and hence

$$\ell=I(w_0)=\frac18\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}w_0^4.$$

Therefore, using that $(u_n,v_n)\to(w_0,0)$ in L^4, and recalling (3.2), we have

$$c=\lim_{n\to\infty}J_\beta(u_n,v_n)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac18\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_n^4+\beta u_n^2v_n^2+v_n^4=\frac18\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}w_0^4=\ell.$$

Therefore, in the case $c\neq\ell$ we must have $\lambda_2<0$, and hence $(u_n,v_n)\to(\bar u,\bar v)$ strongly in H^1. If on the other hand $c=\ell$, we proved that in case $\lambda_2\geq 0$ (that is, if we do not have strong convergence of the whole Palais-Smale sequence) we have $u_n\to w_0$ strongly and $v_n\rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in H^1. To check that indeed $v_n\to 0$ strongly in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}$, it is sufficient to recall that $(u_n,v_n)\in\mathcal{P}_\beta$ for every n, so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla v_n|^2=\frac34\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(u_n^4+2\beta u_n^2v_n^2+v_n^4\right)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u_n|^2\to\frac34\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}w_0^4-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla w_0|^2$$

as $n \to \infty$. Since $w_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, the last term is equal to 0, that is $\|v_n\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} \to 0$, as desired. □

4. Dependence on the energy level $\inf_{\mathcal{P}_\beta} J_\beta$ with respect to β

In the first part of this section we analyze the behavior of the energy level $\inf_{\mathcal{P}_\beta} J_\beta$ when β varies. We stress that $\beta = 0$ is included in our analysis. We set

$$m_\beta := \inf_{\mathcal{P}_\beta} J_\beta,$$

and define the functional $R_\beta : \mathcal{E}_\beta \to (0, +\infty)$ (with $\mathcal{E}_\beta$ introduced in (2.3)) by

$$R_\beta(u,v) := \frac{8\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2\right)^3}{27\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4\right)^2}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$m_\beta = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}_\beta} R_\beta(u,v).$$

Proof. For every $(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$, the value $s^\beta_{(u,v)}$ defined by (2.4) is equal to 0, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} J_\beta(u,v) &= \frac{1}{6}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{6}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2\right) \cdot \left(\frac{4\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2}{3\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + 2\beta u^2 v^2 + v^4}\right)^2 = R_\beta(u,v) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}_\beta} R_\beta. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $m_\beta \geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}_\beta} R_\beta$. For the reverse inequality, it is not difficult to check that $R_\beta(u,v) = R_\beta(s \star (u,v))$ for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.1 we deduce that for any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{E}_\beta$ we have

$$R_\beta(u,v) = R_\beta(s^\beta_{(u,v)} \star (u,v)) = J_\beta(s^\beta_{(u,v)} \star (u,v)) \geq m_\beta.$$ □

Lemma 4.2. *The level m_β is monotone non-increasing in β. In particular, $m_\beta \geq m_0$ for every $\beta \leq 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\beta_1 < \beta_2 \leq 0$ but $m_{\beta_2} > m_{\beta_1}$. Notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + v^4 + 2\beta_1 u^2 v^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 + v^4 + 2\beta_2 u^2 v^2, \tag{4.1}$$

and hence $\mathcal{E}_{\beta_1} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\beta_2}$. Since $m_{\beta_2} > m_{\beta_1}$, there exists $(u,v) \in \mathcal{E}_{\beta_1}$ such that $m_{\beta_2} > R_{\beta_1}(u,v) \geq m_{\beta_1}$. But then $(u,v) \in \mathcal{E}_{\beta_2}$, and using again (4.1) we deduce that

$$m_{\beta_2} > R_{\beta_1}(u,v) \geq R_{\beta_2}(u,v) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}_{\beta_2}} R_{\beta_2} = m_{\beta_2},$$

a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.3. *It results that $m_0 = \inf_{\mathcal{P}_0} J_0 > 0$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, which asserts that there exists a universal constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^4 \leq C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla w|^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \qquad \text{for all } w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Then, if $(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_0$ we have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4+v^4\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \le C_2\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} + C_2\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v^4\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \le C_3\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2+|\nabla v|^2 = C_4\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4+v^4,$$

where the constants depend only on a. Since any $(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_0$ cannot vanish identically, we deduce that

$$\inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_0} J_0(u,v) = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_0} \frac{1}{6}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2+|\nabla v|^2 \ge \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_0} C_5\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4+v^4\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \ge \frac{C_5}{C_4^2}. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.4. *For every $\beta\le 0$ it results that $m_\beta=\ell$.*

Proof. We show first that $m_\beta\ge\ell$, and to this purpose it is sufficient to show that $m_0\ge\ell$, due to Lemma 4.2. Arguing by contradiction we suppose that $0<m_0<\ell$, and consider a minimizing sequence $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ for m_0. It is not restrictive to assume that $u_n,v_n\ge 0$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and hence by Proposition 3.2 we have that up to a subsequence $(u_n,v_n)\to(u_0,v_0)$ strongly in H^1. Since $\beta=0$, the system (1.1) is given by two uncoupled equations, and both u_0 and v_0 are positive radial solutions to (1.3). By uniqueness, we deduce that $u_0=v_0=w_0$, and hence

$$\ell > m_0 = J_\beta(u_0,v_0) = I(u_0)+I(v_0) = 2\ell \quad \text{with} \quad \ell>0,$$

a contradiction.

Now we show that $m_\beta\le\ell$. According to Lemma 3.10 in [6], there exists a sequence $\{(u_n,v_n)\}\subset\mathcal{P}_\beta$ such that $J_\beta(u_n,v_n)\to\ell$, $u_n\to w_0$ strongly in H^1, and $v_n\to 0$ strongly in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}$. The inequality $m_\beta\le\ell$ follows immediately. $\square$

Let us define the involution $\sigma: H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)\to H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\sigma(u,v):=(v,u)$. Notice that $J_\beta(\sigma(u,v))=J_\beta(u,v)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ is σ-invariant (that is $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\beta)=\mathcal{P}_\beta$). Moreover σ has no fixed points in $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ for $\beta\le -1$, because

$$(u,u)\in\mathcal{P}_\beta \quad\Longrightarrow\quad 0<\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u|^2 = \frac{3}{4}(1+\beta)\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 \le 0.$$

Next we consider the fixed point set $\mathcal{P}_\beta^\sigma:=\{(u,v)\in\mathcal{P}_\beta : u=v\}$ as $\beta\to -1$, and the infimum $m_\beta^\sigma:=\inf_{\mathcal{P}_\beta^\sigma} J_\beta$.

Lemma 4.5. *For $\beta\downarrow -1$ there holds $m_\beta^\sigma\to\infty$.*

Proof. This is a simple consequence of the Gagliardo -Nirenberg inequality: if $(u,u)\in\mathcal{P}_\beta^\sigma$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u|^2 = \frac{3}{4}(1+\beta)\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^4 \le \frac{3C_1a}{4}(1+\beta)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u|^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

whence it follows that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla u|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ge \frac{4}{3C_1a(1+\beta)}. \qquad \square$$

5. The minimax scheme

In this section we set up a minimax scheme using the Krasnoselskii genus-type argument. For any closed σ-invariant set $A\subset\mathcal{P}_\beta$, we define the *genus* $\gamma(A)$ as the smallest integer $n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ such that there exists a continuous map $h: A\to\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}$ with $h(\sigma(u,v))=-h(u,v)$ for every $(u,v)\in A$. If no such map exists we set $\gamma(A)=+\infty$. We also note that $\gamma(\emptyset)=0$. Below, we report some standard properties of γ, stated and proved for instance in [8, Lemma 4.4].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $A,B\subset\mathcal{P}_\beta$ be closed and σ-invariant. We have:*

(*i*) *if* $A \subset B$, *then* $\gamma(A) \le \gamma(B)$.
(*ii*) $\gamma(A \cup B) \le \gamma(A) + \gamma(B)$.
(*iii*) *If* $h : A \to \mathcal{P}_\beta$ *is continuous and* σ*-equivariant, i.e.* $h(\sigma(u,v)) = \sigma(h(u,v))$ *for every* $(u,v) \in A$, *then* $\gamma(A) \le \gamma(\overline{h(A)})$.

For a subset $A \subset \mathcal{P}_\beta$ *that does not contain fixed points of* σ, *there holds:*

(*iv*) *if* $\gamma(A) > 1$, *then* A *is an infinite set.*
(*v*) *If* A *is compact, then* $\gamma(A) < +\infty$, *and there exists a relatively open* σ*-invariant neighborhood* N *of* A *in* $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ *such that* $\gamma(A) = \gamma(\overline{N})$.

Finally,

(*vi*) *if* S *is the boundary of a bounded symmetric neighborhood of zero in a* k*-dimensional normed vector space and* $\psi : S \to \mathcal{P}_\beta$ *is a continuous map satisfying* $\psi(-s) = \sigma(\psi(s))$, *then* $\gamma(\psi(S)) \ge k$.

Let now $\mathcal{A}_\beta := \{A \subset \mathcal{P}_\beta : \ A \text{ is closed and } \sigma\text{-invariant}\}$, and, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define

$$\mathcal{A}_{k,\beta} := \{A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta : \ A \text{ is compact and } \gamma(A) \ge k\}.$$

We define the minimax level

$$c_k = c_{k,\beta} := \inf_{A \in \mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}} \max_{(u,v)\in A} J_\beta(u,v) = \inf\{c > 0 : \gamma(J_\beta^c) \ge k\}$$

where $J_\beta^c = \{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta : J_\beta(u,v) \le c\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Any* $c_{k,\beta}$ *is a real number, that is* $\mathcal{A}_{k,\beta} \neq \emptyset$ *for every* k. *Moreover, for every* $k \ge 1$ *there exists* $C_k > 0$ *independent by* $\beta < 0$ *such that* $0 < c_{k,\beta} < C_k$.

Proof. Choose a k-dimensional subspace W of $\{w \in H^1_{\mathrm{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w = 0\}$, and set $T := \{w \in W : \|w\|_{H^1} = 1\}$. Let us consider the maps $\phi : T \to \mathcal{S}$ and $\psi : T \to \mathcal{P}_\beta$ defined by

$$\phi(w) := \left(\frac{a}{\|w\|_{L^2}} w^+, \frac{a}{\|w\|_{L^2}} w^-\right), \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(w) := s^\beta_{\phi(w)} \star \phi(w),$$

where $s^\beta_{\phi(w)}$ is defined by (2.4). Notice that, since the components of $\phi(w)$ have disjoint positivity sets, $s^\beta_{\phi(w)}$ is independent of β; hence, $\psi(T) \subset \mathcal{P}_\beta$ for every β. Analogously, any function in $\psi(T)$ has components with disjoint positivity set, so that $J_\beta(u,v)$ is independent of β for every $(u,v) \in \psi(T)$.

Observe that ψ is continuous by Lemma 2.7 in [6] and that $\psi(-w) = \sigma(\psi(w))$. Now Lemma 5.1 (*vi*) implies $\gamma(\psi(T)) \ge k$, $\psi(T) \subset \mathcal{P}_\beta$ is σ-invariant, and $\psi(T)$ is compact as the continuous image of a compact set. Consequently $\psi(T) \in \mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}$ for every β, and moreover

$$c_{k,\beta} \le \max_{\psi(T)} J_\beta =: C_k,$$

as desired. □

Now we define for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\beta_k := \inf\{\beta \in (-1,0) : c_{k+1,\beta} \ge m^\sigma_\beta\} \in (-1,0).$$

Clearly $c_{k,\beta} < m^\sigma_\beta$ provided $\beta < \beta_k$.

Lemma 5.3. *For any* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *and any* $\beta < \beta_k$ *there exists a Palais-Smale sequence* $\{(u_n^k, v_n^k)\}$ *for* $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ *at level* $c_{k,\beta}$, *satisfying the additional condition* $(u_n^k)^-, (v_n^k)^- \to 0$ *a.e. in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Proof. We aim at applying Theorem 7.2 in [10] (the equivariant strong form of the minimax principle). To this purpose, using point (iii) in Lemma 5.1, it is immediate to check that the family $\mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}$ is a σ-equivariant homotopy stable family with boundary $\emptyset$, according to Definition 7.1 in [10]. Moreover, the superlevel set

$$J_{\beta,c_{k,\beta}} := \{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta : J_\beta(u,v) \geq c_{k,\beta}\} \tag{5.1}$$

is σ-invariant and *dual* to $\mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}$, that is $J_{\beta,c_{k,\beta}} \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}$.

Let then $\{A_n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{k,\beta}$ be a minimizing sequence for c_k: $\max_{A_n} J_\beta \to c_k$ as $n \to \infty$. We note that then also $|A_n|$ is a minimizing sequence, where

$$|A_n| := \{(|u|,|v|) : \ (u,v) \in A_n\}, \qquad \text{for all } n. \tag{5.2}$$

Indeed, $|A_n|$ inherits the equivariancy and the compactness from A_n, and by point (iii) in Lemma 5.1 we have $\gamma(|A_n|) \geq \gamma(A_n) \geq k$ for every k. As a consequence, Theorem 7.2 in [10] is applicable, and implies the existence of a Palais-Smale sequence $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ for $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ at level c_k with the properties that

$$\mathrm{dist}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)}((u_n,v_n),|A_n|) \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{dist}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)}((u_n,v_n),J_{\beta,c_k}) \to 0.$$

In particular, $u_n^-, v_n^- \to 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$. □

We define now the critical set

$$\mathcal{K}_c^+ := \left\{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta : \ u,v \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^3, \ J_\beta(u,v) = c, \ dJ_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}(u,v) = 0\right\}.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Fix $\beta < 0$ and suppose that $c = c_{j,\beta} = c_{j+1,\beta} = \cdots = c_{j+p,\beta}$ for some $j \geq 1$, $p \geq 0$. If $c \neq \ell$, then $\gamma(\mathcal{K}_c^+) > p$.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $\gamma(\mathcal{K}_c^+) \leq p$. By Proposition 3.2, we have that $\mathcal{K}_c^+$ is compact. Then, by point (v) of Lemma 5.1, there exists an open σ-invariant neighborhood N of $\mathcal{K}_c^+$ in $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ such that $\gamma(\overline{N}) \leq p$. Now, let $A \in \mathcal{A}_{j+p,\beta}$ be arbitrarily chosen. Since $A \subset (A \setminus N) \cup \overline{N}$, by point (ii) of Lemma 5.1 we infer that $\gamma(A \setminus N) \geq j$, that is $A \setminus N \in \mathcal{A}_{j,\beta}$. But then, by the definition of c_j, we have that $(A \setminus N) \cap J_{\beta,c_j} \neq \emptyset$, where $J_{\beta,c_{j,\beta}}$ is the superlevel set of J_β, defined as in (5.1). For $F := J_{\beta,c_j} \setminus N$, we deduce that $F \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}_{j+p,\beta}$. This means that F is σ-invariant and dual to the σ-invariant homotopy stable family with empty boundary $\mathcal{A}_{j+p,\beta}$. Therefore, applying Theorem 7.2 in [10] as in the previous proof, we deduce that there exists a Palais-Smale sequence $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ for $J_\beta|_{\mathcal{P}_\beta}$ at level $c = c_{j+p,\beta}$ such that $u_n^-, v_n^- \to 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and moreover

$$\mathrm{dist}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)}((u_n,v_n), J_{\beta,c_j} \setminus N) \to 0.$$

But then Proposition 3.2 implies $(u_n,v_n) \to (u,v) \in \mathcal{K}_c^+$ strongly in H^1 up to a subsequence, and at the same time

$$\mathrm{dist}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)}((u,v), J_{\mathcal{P}_\beta,c_j} \setminus N) = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mathrm{dist}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^2)}((u,v),\mathcal{K}_c^+) > 0$$

by definition of N. This is a contradiction. □

6. Completion of the proof of the main results

Combining Proposition 3.2 and Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, the only fact that one has to check in order to obtain Theorem 1.1 is that

$$\ell < c_{2,\beta} \leq \ldots \leq c_{k+1,\beta} < m_\beta^\sigma \quad \text{for } \beta < \beta_k.$$

Only the first inequality $\ell < c_{2,\beta}$ is not obvious. This is a consequence of the following statement.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that the nonnegative closed sublevel set*

$$J^{\ell+\delta}_{\mathcal{P}^+_\beta} := \left\{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta : \ u, v \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^3, \ J_\beta(u,v) \leq \ell + \delta\right\}$$

has genus 1.

Proof. We claim that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$, $u, v \geq 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $J_\beta(u,v) \leq \ell + \delta$ implies

$$\text{either} \quad \|u - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|v\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} < \varepsilon, \quad \text{or} \quad \|v - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} < \varepsilon. \tag{6.1}$$

If this claim were false, then we would find $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sequence $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_\beta$ such that $J_\beta(u_n, v_n) \to \ell$ and

$$\text{both} \quad \|u_n - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|v_n\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} \geq \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_n - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|u_n\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} \geq \varepsilon.$$

By Lemma 4.4, this is a minimizing sequence (thus a Palais-Smale one) for J_β on $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ at level ℓ, which cannot satisfy alternative (ii) in Proposition 3.2. Therefore, alternative (i) holds: $(u_n, v_n) \to (u_\beta, v_\beta)$, where (u_β, v_β), and (u_β, v_β) is a positive solution to (1.1) at level ℓ achieving the minimum of J_β on $\mathcal{P}_\beta$. By Lemma 4.1, this says that (u_β, v_β) is a minimizer for R_β on $\mathcal{E}_\beta$. But then, observing that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_\beta^2 v_\beta^2 > 0$ since both u_β and v_β are strictly positive in $\mathbb{R}^3$ by the maximum principle, we deduce that

$$\ell = R_\beta(u_\beta, v_\beta) > R_0(u_\beta, v_\beta) \geq \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}_0} R_0(u,v) = m_0 = \ell,$$

a contradiction. Thus, claim (6.1) holds.

Let now $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $\|u - w_0\|_{H^1} < \varepsilon$ implies $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} > \varepsilon$. The above argument shows that for any such ε there exists a small positive δ such that $J^{\ell+\delta}_{\mathcal{P}^+} \subset D$, where

$$D := \left\{ (u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \text{either} \quad \|u - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|v\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} < \varepsilon, \\ \text{or} \quad \|v - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} < \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}.$$

By definition, we have that $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ with

$$D_1 := \left\{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_\beta : \ \|u - w_0\|_{H^1} + \|v\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}} < \varepsilon\right\}, \qquad D_2 := \sigma(D_1),$$

and $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$ by the choice of ε. Therefore, D is the disjoint union of two closed sets with $D_2 = \sigma(D_1)$, which implies $\gamma(D) = 1$. By the monotonicity property of the genus, point (i) in Lemma 5.1, the thesis follows. □

Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Since β is fixed, we omit such dependence. Since $c_k \leq c_{k+1}$ for every $k \geq 1$, we can prove that $c_2 > c_1 = \inf_{\mathcal{P}} J = \ell$. By contradiction, suppose that $c_2 = c_1$. Then there exists a sequence $\{A_n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_2$ with $\sup_{A_n} J \to \ell$, and in particular $\sup_{A_n} J \leq \ell + \delta$ for every n sufficiently large. Let us consider the set $|A_n|$, defined in (5.2). By point (iii) of Lemma 5.1, we know that $\gamma(|A_n|) \geq \gamma(A_n) \geq 2$ for every n; on the other hand, observing that $J(u,v) = J(|u|,|v|)$ for every $(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}$, we deduce that $|A_n| \subset J^{\ell+\delta}_{\mathcal{P}^+}$, and hence by point (i) of Lemma 5.1 together with Lemma 6.1 we have also $\gamma(|A_n|) \leq \gamma(J^{\ell+\delta}_{\mathcal{P}^+}) = 1$, a contradiction.

It remains to show that, for $\beta \leq -\mu$, we have $J(u_k, v_k) \to +\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$. Let us introduce the generalized Morse index $m_{\mathcal{P}}(u,v)$ of $J|_{\mathcal{P}}$ in a critical point (u,v) as the dimension of the negative and null eigenspace of the linearized operator $d^2 J_{\mathcal{P}}(u,v)$. Similarly we write $m(u,v)$ for the generalized Morse index of J on $\mathcal{S}$. Observe that these differ by at most one because $\mathcal{P}$ is a codimension one submanifold of $\mathcal{S}$. In fact, $m(u,v) = m_{\mathcal{P}}(u,v)+1$, because the path $t \mapsto t*(u,v)$ is transversal to $\mathcal{P}$, and J achieves its maximum along the path at $t = 0$. By [10, Corollary 10.5], the min-max characterization of (u_k, v_k) yields an estimate on the Morse index (on the line of [1,20]), and to be precise we have that $m_{\mathcal{P}}(u_k, v_k) \geq k$. Now, let us assume that $c_k \to \bar{c} < +\infty$. Then

the sequence (u_k, v_k) is a Palais-Smale sequence for $J|_{\mathcal{P}}$ at level $\bar{c} > \ell$ made of positive functions. Hence, by Proposition 3.2, it is convergent to a limit $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$, which is a positive radial solution to (1.1) and has therefore finite generalized Morse index. This can be seen as follows. The gradient $\nabla_u J : \mathcal{S} \to TS_a$ with respect to the standard scalar product in H^1 is given by

$$\nabla_u J(u,v) = (-\Delta + 1)^{-1} \left(-\Delta u - u^3 - \beta u v^2 - \lambda_1(u,v)u\right)$$

where $\lambda_1(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}$ is determined by the equation $\nabla_u J(u,v) \in T_u S_a$, i.e. $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u \cdot \nabla_u J(u,v) = 0$. Similarly we obtain

$$\nabla_v J(u,v) = (-\Delta + 1)^{-1} \left(-\Delta v - v^3 - \beta u^2 v - \lambda_2(u,v)v\right).$$

Therefore the Hessian of J at the critical point $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ in the direction $(\phi, \psi) \in T_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}\mathcal{S}$ is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 J(\bar{u},\bar{v})[(\phi,\psi),(\phi,\psi)] = &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(|\nabla\phi|^2 + |\nabla\psi|^2 - \lambda_1(\bar{u},\bar{v})\phi^2 - \lambda_2(\bar{u},\bar{v})\psi^2\right) \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left((3u^2 + \beta v^2)\phi^2 - (3v^2 + \beta u^2)\psi^2 - 4\beta uv\phi\psi\right). \end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{u}\phi = 0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{v}\psi$. Here $\lambda_1(\bar{u},\bar{v}), \lambda_2(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ are the Lagrange multipliers of the solution $(\bar{u},\bar{v})$, hence they are negative. Therefore the first integral above is strictly positive definite, whereas the second integral defines a quadratic form on $T_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}\mathcal{S} \subset H^1_{\rm rad} \times H^1_{\rm rad}$ which is even defined, and continuous, on $L^4 \times L^4$. Since the embedding of $H^1_{\rm rad}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ into $L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is compact, the negative eigenspace and the kernel of $D^2 J(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ must be finite-dimensional, and $D^2 J(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ is strictly positive definite on a subspace $X^+ \subset T_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}\mathcal{S}$ of finite codimension, i.e. $D^2 J(\bar{u},\bar{v})[(\phi,\psi),(\phi,\psi)] \geq c\|(\phi,\psi)\|^2$ for some $c > 0$, and all $(\phi,\psi) \in X^+$. This, however, contradicts the fact that $m(u_k, v_k) \to +\infty$, and completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We can proceed exactly as in Section 3.4 in [6]. □

References

[1] A. Bahri and P. L. Lions. Morse index of some min-max critical points. i. application to multiplicity results. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 41(8):1027–1037, 1988.

[2] T. Bartsch, N. Dancer and Z.-Q. Wang. A Liouville theorem, a-priori bounds, and bifurcating branches of positive solutions for a nonlinear elliptic system. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 37(3-4):345–361, 2010.

[3] T. Bartsch and S. de Valeriola. Normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 100(1):75–83, 2012.

[4] T. Bartsch and L. Jeanjean. Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* (to appear), arXiv: 1507.04649, 2015.

[5] T. Bartsch, L. Jeanjean, and N. Soave. Normalized solutions for a system of coupled cubic Schrödinger equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 106(4):583–614, 2016.

[6] T. Bartsch and N. Soave. A natural constraint approach to normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, in press. Doi: 10.1016/j.jfa.2017.01.025.

[7] D. Cao, I.-L. Chern, J. Wei. On ground state of spinor Bose-Einstein condensates. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 18: 427–445, 2011.

[8] E. Dancer, J. Wei, and T. Weth. A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 27(3):953 – 969, 2010.

[9] G. Fibich and F. Merle, Self-focusing on bounded domains. *Phys. D* 155:12 , 132–158, 2001.

[10] N. Ghoussoub. *Duality and perturbation methods in critical point theory*, volume 107 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. With appendices by David Robinson.

[11] T. Gou and L. Jeanjean. Existence and orbital stability of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Nonlinear Analysis: TMA*, 144:10–22, 2016.

[12] L. Jeanjean. Existence of solutions with prescribed norm for semilinear elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 28(10):1633–1659, 1997.

[13] P. L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. the locally compact case, part 1. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(2):109–145, 1984.
[14] P. L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. the locally compact case, part 2. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(4):223–283, 1984.
[15] N. V. Nguyen and Z.-Q. Wang. Existence and stability of a two-parameter family of solitary waves for a 2-coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36(2):1005–1021, 2016.
[16] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. Convergence of minimax structures and continuation of critical points for singularly perturbed systems. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 14(4):1245–1273, 2012.
[17] B. Noris, H. Tavares, and G. Verzini. Existence and orbital stability of the ground states with prescribed mass for the L^2-critical and supercritical NLS on bounded domains. *Anal. PDE* 7(8) (2014), 1807–1838.
[18] B. Noris, H. Tavares, and G. Verzini. Stable solitary waves with prescribed L^2-mass for the cubic Schrödinger system with trapping potentials. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 35(12):6085–6112, 2015.
[19] D. Pierotti, G. Verzini. Normalized bound states for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in bounded domains. Preprint arXiv:1607.04520, 2016.
[20] S. Solimini. Morse index estimates in min-max theorems. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, 63(4):421–453, 1989.
[21] C. A. Stuart. Bifurcation for Dirichlet problems without eigenvalues. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 45(1):169–192, 1982.
[22] C. A. Stuart. Bifurcation from the continuous spectrum in L^2-theory of elliptic equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$. Recent Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications, Liguori, Napoli, 1981.

Thomas Bartsch
Mathematisches Institut, Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen,
Arndtstrasse 2, 35392 Giessen (Germany).
E-mail address: Thomas.Bartsch@math.uni-giessen.de.

Nicola Soave
Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano,
Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32, 20133 Milano (Italy).
E-mail address: nicola.soave@gmail.com, nicola.soave@polimi.it